

Appln No. 10/760,211
Amdt. Dated February 2, 2005
Response to Office Action of December 16, 2004

9

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Applicant thanks the Examiner for the detailed Office Action of 12/16/2004. The objections and submissions made by the Examiner in the Office Action have been carefully considered. In response, the claims have been amended to emphasize the distinguishing features of the invention.

Specification

The Examiner requests the use of application serial numbers for cross-referencing the co-pending applications on pages 1 and 2. In response, all references on these two pages have been amended to refer to the serial application numbers of the respective applications.

The Examiner has also objected to the British spelling in the specification. In response, it is submitted that 37 CFR 1.52(b)(1)(ii) only requires the application to be in English and there is no additional requirement that the English must be American English. The allowability of British English spelling is specifically referred to in MPEP 608.01.

Claim Numbering

In response to the Examiner's comments, both the claim numbering and the reference numbering within the claims after claim 22 have amended.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC §103

The Examiner has rejected claims 1 - 9, 11, 13 - 17 and 20 - 28 as being unpatentable over Cook (US 6786655), in view of Bobry (US 6,229,565) and Silverbrook (US 6,363,868). Claim 10 has been also rejected as being unpatentable over Cook, in view of Bobry, Silverbrook and Bauman (US 6,583,852) or Ikeda (US 6,801,296).

However, as the Examiner has noted correctly, none of the cited prior art documents teaches more than one printing head, as claimed in former claim 12. Accordingly, in response to the Examiner's rejections, the Applicant has amended claim 1 to include this distinguishing feature. The amendment of claim 1 has necessitated corresponding amendments to claims 11 and 12. The Applicant submits that no new features have been defined in the amended claims.

As submitted above, none of the cited prior art documents discloses, or even suggests, the use of two-headed printing assembly for consecutive or simultaneous printing on one or both sides of a single page of a print medium. Therefore, an ordinary worker in this field, apprised of these prior art documents, would not derive the specific combination of features defined by the amended claim 1 as a matter of straightforward routine. Accordingly, claim 1 clearly possesses the requisite inventive step to qualify for patentability. Consequently, claims 2 to 29 are also non-obvious, by virtue of their dependence on claim 1.

Allowable Subject Matter

The Applicant thanks the Examiner for his comments in this section. In light of these comments and the above discussion, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner's

Appin No. 10/760.211
Amdt. Dated February 2, 2005
Response to Office Action of December 16, 2004

10

objections have been successfully traversed and that the application is now in condition for allowance.


Reconsideration and allowance of the application is courteously solicited.

Very respectfully,

Applicants:



KIA SILVERBROOK



TOBIN ALLEN KING

C/o: Silverbrook Research Pty Ltd
393 Darling Street
Balmain NSW 2041, Australia
Email: kia.silverbrook@silverbrookresearch.com
Telephone: +612 9818 6633
Facsimile: +61 2 9555 7762